



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,972	06/29/2001	Yngve Ternulf	0104-0345P	5129

2292 7590 08/11/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

YANG, RYAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/856,972

Applicant(s)

TERNULF ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan R Yang

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is independent claim. This action is non-final.
2. This application is a 371 of PCT/SE98/02183 filed 11/30/1998.
3. The present title of the invention is "Method for inserting objects into a working area in a computer application".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright et al. (5,051,898).

As per claim 1, Wright et al., hereinafter Wright, discloses a method for facilitating the inserting of an object into a working area (7) on a computer display (6) said method being performed by a computer application software (1) for creating a logical network and comprising the step of

receiving input (9) from the user (3) selecting where on the screen an object of a previously specified object type is to be inserted (Figure 2 26 or 28 "A slot is a field

Art Unit: 2672

associated with a tool object for containing as a data kind", column 4, line 34-36),
characterized by the steps of

identifying (30; 42) at least one subarea (23a-d; 23'; 23'') of the working area (7)
where an object is insertable (Figure 2 26 or 28),

identifying (31; 43) what type of object can be insertable in said subarea ("the slot
parameter indication for the appropriate object kinds for that slot includes the object kind
representing by the icon 16", column 4, line 54-56),

indicating (33;45) said at least one subarea (Figure 2 26 or 28),

Indicating (34; 46) said object type (26a-d; 26'; 26'') in association with each
subarea (23a-d; 23'; 23'') ("the slot parameter indication for the appropriate object kinds
for that slot includes the object kind representing by the icon 16", column 4, line 54-56),

receiving input (35; 47) from the user selecting one of said at least one subarea
("It indicates to the user that an object of the same kind as shown in FIG. 1 can be
inserted into slot 26", column 4, line 52-54), and

inserting (36; 49) into the selected subarea an object of the type that is indicated
in association with the selected subarea (Figure 2 116 where the object in Figure 1 16 is
inserted).

6. As per claim 2, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection
of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses the step of indicating (33; 45) at
least one subarea of the working area where an object is insertable comprises
graphically outlining said at least one subarea (Figure 2 26).

7. As per claim 3, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of claims 1 or 2, supra, and further discloses the indication (33) of said at least one subarea is activatable and deactivatable by the user (3) ("FIG. 2 represents a state of completed action which was previous carried out by **"clicking" an icon 16** and inserting it in slot", column 4, line 50-52, and "If an attempt were to be made to insert an object of an impermissible data kind in a slot, an error message is generated", column 4, line 56-59, thus, indicating the selected area is activated).

8. As per claim 4, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses wherein input (9) from the user is received using a pointing device (5) ("The run button may also be used to invoke the tool by positioning of a user-controlled pointing device", column 2, line 41-43).

9. As per claim 5, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 4, supra, and further discloses the pointing device (5) is in electronic contact with the computer application (1) and controls a cursor (28) on the display (6) ("The run button may also be used to invoke the tool by positioning of a user-controlled pointing device to place an indicator on the viewing screen over the run button, followed by invocation of a signal (a "click") on the pointing device", column 2, line 41-45, and "The buttons are invoked by clicking the feature, that is, placing a cursor at the button and pressing an execute key", column 5, line 38-40, thus, indicating the pointing device is in electronic contact with the computer application and controls a cursor).

10. As per claim 7, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 4, supra, and further discloses the step of indicating (34; 46) an

Art Unit: 2672

object type in association with each subarea comprises displaying a symbol (26a-d) representing said object type in connection to said subarea (Figure 2 120 for subarea 24 and 116 for subarea 26).

11. As per claim 9, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses the object types represent various physical items that are inserted into the working area to create said network ("It indicates to the user that an object of the same kind as shown in FIG. 1 can be inserted into slot 26, and that the slot parameter indication for the appropriate object kinds for that slot includes the object kind represented by the icon 16", column 4, line 52-56)

12. As per claim 10, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 9 supra, and further discloses the network represents a system for automation (Since the method is for invocation of a computer tool, Abstract, the network represents a system of automation.)

13. As per claim 11, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1 supra, and further discloses computer-readable medium, on which is stored instructions for one or several general purpose computers (2), comprising means (15, 16, 18, 19) for enabling said one or said several computers (2) to perform the steps of the method according to claim 1 (Since the invention by Wright is a computer program useful in a computer system, it is inherent the program is stored in a computer-readable medium to be executed on a computer).

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (5,051,898) and further in view of Cariffe et al. (6,201,548).

As per claim 6, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 4 or 5, supra.

Wright discloses a method for inserting an object into a working area. It is noted that Wright does not explicitly disclose the step of indicating (45) at least one subarea (23'; 23'') of the working area where an object of a type that is insertable comprises graphically outlining said subarea when the cursor (28) is moved into said subarea, however, this is known in the art as taught by Cariffe et al., hereinafter Cariffe. Cariffe discloses an image editing method in which a portion of the image is outlined when the cursor is moved into the subarea (column 1, line 16-18).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Cariffe into Wright because Wright discloses a method for inserting an object into a working area and Cariffe discloses the area of interest the cursor moves into is outlined in order for it to be easily distinguished from the rest of the area.

16. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (5,051,898) and further in view of Hernandez et al. (4,686,522).

As per claim 8, Wright demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of dependent claim 5, *supra*.

Wright discloses a method for inserting an object into a working area. It is noted that Wright does not explicitly disclose the step of indicating (46) an object type in association with each subarea (23'; 23'') comprises changing the appearance of the cursor (28), however, this is known in the art as taught by Hernandez et al., hereinafter Hernandez. Hernandez discloses a method of editing graphics objects in which the appearance of the cursor changes when associated with a region ("while only one cursor is displayed, its appearance is changed from a blinking cursor to a pointing cursor during the process which is selecting the particular action", column 2, line 51-54).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hernandez into Wright because Wright discloses a method for inserting an object into a working area and Hernandez discloses appearance of the cursor changes when associated with a region in order to easily edit a graphical object.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Inquiries

Art Unit: 2672

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Ryan Yang** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-6133**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4713**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks


Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.


Ryan Yang
August 4, 2003